

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Upon entry of the foregoing amendments, claims 34-117 are pending in this application with claims 34, 35, 43, 44, 52, 53, 61, and 62 being the independent claims. New claims 110-117 have been added.

Based on the above Amendment and the following Remarks, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

The Office Action on page 2, in section 3, objects to claim 109 because of an informality. Claim 109 has been amended to remove the noted informality. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

The Office Action on pages 3-6, in sections 5-6, rejects claims 34-37, 42-46, 49, 50, 52-55, 58, 59, 61, 62, and 66-109 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,553,127 to Kurokowski et al (the '127 patent).

Amended independent Claim 34 recites an image processing system comprising "an image providing apparatus which defines a location information indicating a plurality of regions in image data for embedding a digital watermark in *all regions containing a document information* among the plurality of regions and providing said image data, in which said digital watermark is embedded based on said location information." Referring to Figure 34 of the present application, for example, in an exemplary embodiment of the invention, document information 1114 may be sent to the document format database 1112. In such an embodiment, the document information may show the identification of the document classification. Specification, page 78, lines 21-25.

The '127 patent does not teach or suggest "an image providing apparatus which defines a location information indicating a plurality of regions in image data for embedding a digital watermark in *all regions containing a document information* among the plurality of regions and

providing said image data, in which said digital watermark is embedded based on said location information." Instead, the '127 patent teaches selecting blocks of a data stream according to a texture criterion that measures a variation of selected characteristics associated with each data element of the data stream. See, the '127 patent, col. 3, lines 61-63. According to the '127 patent and referring to Figure 1 therein, a block selector 120 tests each incoming block to determine whether a predetermined criterion is satisfied. For example, the block selector may evaluate a "texture" criterion for each block and output a texture value where 0 (zero) indicates a completely flat, featureless and relatively unchanging field within a block and where higher numbers indicate increasing spectral content. See, the '127 patent, col. 6, lines 15-24. In such an embodiment, the watermark embedder 130 receives each block output from the blocker/buffer 115. As long as the block selector 120 does not generate a signal 125 disabling the embedding of a watermark, a watermark is embedded in each and every block. However, should any block fail to satisfy the criterion, the block selector 120 will disable the embedding of a watermark for that block. See, the '127 patent, col. 6, lines 26-33.

The '127 patent does not teach the recited image providing apparatus because the '127 patent instead teaches embedding a watermark based on a signal associated with the satisfaction of a criterion. Embedding a watermark in this manner does not "embed[] a digital watermark in *all regions containing a document information* among the plurality of regions." Hence, the '127 patent does not teach or suggest the recited features of claim 34, and therefore does not anticipate claim 34. Accordingly, claim 34 is allowable over the '127 patent

Independent claim 35 has been amended to recite similar features as claim 34 is allowable over the '127 patent for similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 34.

Claims 36, 37, 42, 66, 67, 90, 91, 94, and 95 variously depend from claim 34 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 36, 37, 68, 69, 92, 93, 96, and 97 variously depend from claim 35 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Independent claims 43 and 44 have been amended to recite similar features as claim 34 are allowable over the ‘127 patent for similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 34.

Claims 45, 46, 49, 70, 71, 74, 75, 98, and 99 variously depend from claim 43 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 45, 46, 50, 72, 73, 76, 77, 108, and 109 variously depend from claim 44 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Independent claims 52 and 53 have been amended to recite similar features as claim 34 are allowable over the ‘127 patent for similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 34.

Claims 54, 55, 58, 78, 79, 82, 83, 100, and 101 variously depend from claim 52 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 54, 55, 59, 80, 81, 84, 85, 102, and 103 variously depend from claim 53 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Independent claims 61 and 62 have been amended to recite similar features as claim 34 are allowable over the ‘127 patent for similar reasons as discussed with respect to claim 34.

Claims 86, 87, 104, and 105 variously depend from claim 61 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

Claims 88, 89, 106, and 107 variously depend from claim 62 and are allowable as being dependent from an allowable claim.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.

The Office Action on pages 6-10, in sections 5-6, rejects claims 38-41, 47, 48, 51, 56, 57, 60, and 63-65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the ‘127 patent in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,504,941 to Wong. Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 38-41 variously depend from claim 34. Claim 65 depends from claim 35. Claims 47-48 and 51 variously depend from claim 43. Claims 56-57 and 60 variously depend from claim 52. Claim 63 depends from claim 61. As discussed above, the ‘127 patent does not teach or suggest the recited features of claims 34, 35, 43, 52, and 61. Wong fails to cure the deficiencies of the ‘127 patent. Instead, Wong teaches stamping the watermark onto the entire area of the image. By stamping a watermark onto the entire area of the image, Wong does not teach "embedding a digital watermark in *all regions containing a document information* among the plurality of regions." Accordingly, the Office Action fails to establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness for claims 38-41, 47, 48, 51, 56, 57, 60, and 63-65 because the combination of the ‘127 patent and Wong does not teach or suggest the recited features of claims 38-41, 47, 48, 51, 56, 57, 60, and 63-65.

In view of the above, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn.


## CONCLUSION

All of the stated grounds of objection and rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding objections and rejections and that they be withdrawn.

Applicant believes that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Prompt and favorable consideration of this Amendment is respectfully requested.

Dated: June 9, 2005

Respectfully submitted,  
  
By \_\_\_\_\_  
Michael A. Sartori, Ph.D.  
Registration No.: 41,289  
Daniel G. Vivarelli, Jr.  
Registration No.: 51,137  
VENABLE LLP  
P.O. Box 34385  
Washington, DC 20043-9998  
(202) 344-4000  
(202) 344-8300 (Fax)  
Attorney/Agent For Applicant

DC2/655509